

Table 1. Summary of hypotheses, corresponding specific predictions, and results. We count predictions as fully supported ('yes') when the response is significant in single-variable tests (Table 4) and included in all top full models and as partially supported ('(yes)') or rejected ('(no)') when the direction of response consistently matched the prediction but the effect was not significant in all models. A dash symbol indicates that the response was not significant in any of the top full models.

Hypotheses & Specific Predictions	Prediction supported?				Results
	Overall	1966	1977	1999	
<b>Tree size and microenvironment</b>					
<i>Larger, taller trees have lower Rt.</i>					
Rt decreases with stem diameter (DBH).	yes	yes	-	-	Table 4
Rt decreases with height (H).	yes	yes	-	(yes)	Tables 4, 5
<i>Trees with more exposed crowns have lower Rt.</i>					
Dominant trees have lowest Rt.	-	yes	(yes)	-	Tables 4, 5
Correcting for H, dominant trees have lowest Rt.	(no)		-	(no)	Tables 4, 5
<i>Small trees (lower root volume) in drier microhabitats have lower Rt.</i>					
There is a negative interactive effect between H and topographic wetness index.	-	-	-	-	Table 4
<b>Species traits</b>					
<i>Species' traits—particularly leaf hydraulic traits—predict Rt.</i>					
Wood density correlates (positively or negatively) to Rt.	-	-	-	-	Table 4
Leaf mass per area correlates positively to Rt.	-	-	-	-	Table 4
Ring-porous species have higher Rt than diffuse- or semi-ring- porous.	-	yes	(no)	yes	Tables 4, 5
Percent loss leaf area upon desiccation correlates negatively with Rt.	yes	yes	(yes)	-	Tables 4, 5
Water potential at turgor loss correlates negatively with Rt.	(yes)	-	(yes)	(yes)	Tables 4, 5

Table 2. Summary of variables.

variable	symbol	units	description		category	n
<b>Dependent variables</b>						
drought resistance	$Rt$	-	ratio of growth during drought year to mean growth of the 5 years prior.		-	1596
	$Rt_{ARIMA}$	-	ratio of growth during drought year to growth predicted by ARIMA model.		-	1596
<b>Independent variables</b>						
drought year	$Y$	-	year of drought		1966 1977 1999	478 547 571
<i>tree size</i>						
diameter breast height	$DBH$	cm	DBH in drought year		-	all
height	$H$	m	estimated H in drought year		-	all
<i>microhabitat</i>						
crown position		-	2018 crown position		dominant (D) co-dominant (C) intermediate (I) suppressed (S)	31 231 224 101
topographic wetness index	$TWI$	-	steady-state wetness index based on slope and upstream contributing area		-	all
<i>species' traits</i>						
wood density	$WD$	$\text{g cm}^{-3}$	dry mass of a unit volume of fresh wood		-	all
leaf mass per area	$LMA$	$\text{kg m}^{-2}$	ratio of leaf dry mass to fresh leaf area		-	all
xylem porosity		-	vessel arrangement in xylem		ring (R) semi-ring (SR) diffuse (D)	408 31 178
turgor loss point	$\pi_{tlp}$	MPa	water potential at which leaves wilt		-	all
percent loss area	$PLA_{dry}$	%	percent loss of leaf area upon dessication		-	all

Table 3. Overview of analyzed species, listed in order of their relative contributions to woody stem productivity ( $ANPP_{stem}$ ) in the plot, along with numbers and sizes sampled, and species traits. Variable abbreviations are as in Table 2.

species	% $ANPP_{stem}$	n cores	DBH (cm)		species traits (mean +/- sd)				
			mean	range	$WD$ ( $g\ cm^{-3}$ )	$LMA$ ( $g\ cm^{-2}$ )	xylem porosity	$\pi_{tp}$ (Mpa)	$PLA$ (%)
Liriodendron tulipifera (LITU)	47.1	98	368.54	100 - 1004	$0.4 \pm 0.03$	$46.92 \pm 12.38$	diffuse	$-1.92 \pm 0.17$	$19.56 \pm 2.06$
Quercus alba (QUAL)	10.7	61	471.51	114 - 791	$0.61 \pm 0.02$	$75.8 \pm 11.05$	ring	$-2.58 \pm 0.08$	$8.52 \pm 0.37$
Quercus rubra (QURU)	10.1	69	548.79	110.7 - 1480	$0.62 \pm 0.02$	$71.13 \pm 6.70$	ring	$-2.64 \pm 0.28$	$11.01 \pm 0.84$
Quercus velutina (QUVE)	7.8	77	541.38	160.2 - 1142	$0.65 \pm 0.04$	$48.69 \pm 3.30$	ring	$-2.39 \pm 0.15$	$13.42 \pm 0.84$
Quercus montana (QUPR)	4.8	59	422.48	105 - 872	$0.61 \pm 0.01$	$71.77 \pm 40.17$	ring	$-2.36 \pm 0.09$	$11.75 \pm 1.37$
Fraxinus americana (FRAM)	3.8	62	353.63	64 - 947.3	$0.56 \pm 0.01$	$43.28 \pm 4.78$	ring	$-2.1 \pm 0.36$	$13.06 \pm 1.06$
Carya glabra (CAGL)	3.7	31	313.89	98 - 985	$0.62 \pm 0.04$	$42.76 \pm 0.94$	ring	$-2.13 \pm 0.50$	$21.09 \pm 5.48$
Juglans nigra (JUNI)	2.1	31	481.42	242 - 870	$1.09 \pm 0.09$	$72.13 \pm 7.10$	semi-ring*	$-2.76 \pm 0.21$	$24.64 \pm 8.72$
Carya cordiformis (CACO)	2.0	13	271.87	107 - 615	$0.83 \pm 0.10$	$45.86 \pm 15.60$	ring	$-2.13 \pm 0.45$	$17.22 \pm 2.25$
Carya tomentosa (CATO)	2.0	13	209.74	121 - 322.1	0.83	45.36	ring	-2.2	16.56
Fagus grandifolia (FAGR)	1.5	80	235.11	112 - 1072	$0.62 \pm 0.03$	$30.68 \pm 4.94$	diffuse	-2.57	$9.45 \pm 1.25$
Carya ovalis (CAOVL)	1.1	23	352.87	149 - 660	$0.96 \pm 0.33$	$47.6 \pm 3.95$	ring	$-2.48 \pm 0.04$	$14.8 \pm 6.34$

\* Semi-ring porosity is intermediate between ring and diffuse. We group it with diffuse-porous species for more even division of species between categories.

Table 4. Individual tests of species traits as drivers of drought resistance (*Rt* metric).

variable	category	all droughts		1966		1977		1999	
		$\Delta\text{AICc}$	coefficients	$\Delta\text{AICc}$	coefficients	$\Delta\text{AICc}$	coefficients	$\Delta\text{AICc}$	coefficients
<b>Species traits</b>									
xylem porosity	R	-4.53	0.0680	2.44**	0.190	1.68*	-0.151	4.01**	0.1580
	D/SR	NA	0.0000		0.000		0.000		0.0000
<i>PLA</i>		-2.85	-0.0140	8.97**	-0.025	-0.27	-0.010	-0.91	-0.0070
<i>LMA</i>		-12.76	0.0001	-1.9	0.001	-1.66	-0.002	-2.07	0.0001
$\pi_{tlp}$		-2.22	-0.1620	-1.78	-0.093	1.27*	-0.251	-0.52	-0.1530
<i>WD</i>		-3.97	-0.0380	-1.17	-0.219	-1.51	-0.151	0.44	0.2650

Variable abbreviations are as in Table 2.  $\Delta\text{AICc}$  is the AICc of a model excluding the trait minus that of the model including it.

\* $\Delta\text{AICc} > 1$ : variable meets  $\Delta\text{AICc}$  criterion for inclusion in full model

\*\* $\Delta\text{AICc} > 2$ : variable is considered significant as an individual predictor (and meets  $\Delta\text{AICc}$  criterion for inclusion in full model)

Table 5. Summary of top full models for each drought instance.


drought	$\Delta AICc$	$R^2$	Intercept	$\ln[H]$	$\ln[TWI]$	$\ln[H] * \ln[TWI]$	crown position				$PLA$	$\pi_{llp}$
							D	C	I	S		
<b>all</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>1.733</b>	<b>-0.245</b>	<b>-0.335</b>	<b>0.088</b>	<b>-0.036</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-0.039</b>	<b>-0.056</b>	<b>-0.014</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>1966</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>2.265</b>	<b>-0.349</b>	<b>-0.336</b>	<b>0.111</b>	<b>-0.041</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>-0.062</b>	<b>-0.024</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>1977</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.902</b>	<b>-0.152</b>	<b>-0.358</b>	<b>0.078</b>	<b>-0.069</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-0.029</b>	<b>0.035</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-0.253</b>
<b>1999</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>1.152</b>	<b>-0.141</b>	<b>-0.229</b>	<b>0.046</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-0.075</b>	<b>-0.088</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-0.151</b>
	0.385	0.21	1.610	-0.141	-0.227	0.046	-0.001	0	-0.077	-0.091	-0.007	-

Models are ranked by AICc. Shown are all models whose AICc value falls within 1.0 ( $\Delta AICc < 1$ ) of the best model (bold).


## Figure Legends

**Figure 1. Climate and species-level growth responses over our study period, highlighting the three focal droughts (a) and community-wide responses** Time series plot (a) shows peak growing season (May-August) climate conditions and residual chronologies for each species. PET and PRE data were obtained from the Climatic Research Unit high-resolution gridded dataset (CRU TS v.4.01; Harris et al. 2014). Focal droughts are indicated by dashed lines, and shading indicates the pre-drought period used in calculations of the resistance metric. Figure modified from Helcoski *et al.* (2019). Density plots (b) show the distribution of resistance values for each drought.

**Figure 2. Height profiles in growing season climatic conditions and tree heights by crown position** Shown are averages ( $\pm$  SD) of daily maxima and minima of (a) wind speed, (b) relative humidity ( $RH$ ), and (c) air temperature ( $T_{air}$ ) averaged over each month of the peak growing season (May-August) from 2016-2018. In these plots, heights are slightly offset for visualization purposes. Also shown is (d) 2018 tree heights by canopy position (see Table 2 for codes). In all plots, the dashed horizontal line indicates the 95th percentile of tree heights in the ForestGEO plot.



**Figure 1. Climate and species-level growth responses over our study period, highlighting the three focal droughts (a) and community-wide responses** Time series plot (a) shows peak growing season (May-August) climate conditions and residual chronologies for each species. PET and PRE data were obtained from the Climatic Research Unit high-resolution gridded dataset (CRU TS v.4.01; Harris et al. 2014). Focal droughts are indicated by dashed lines, and shading indicates the pre-drought period used in calculations of the resistance metric. Figure modified from Helcoski *et al.* (2019). Density plots (b) show the distribution of resistance values for each drought.



**Figure 2. Height profiles in growing season climatic conditions, tree heights by crown position, and leaf hydraulic traits** The top row shows averages ( $\pm$  SD) of daily maxima and minima of (a) wind speed, (b) relative humidity ( $RH$ ), and (c) air temperature ( $T_{air}$ ) averaged over each month of the peak growing season (May-August) from 2016-2018. In these plots, heights are slightly offset for visualization purposes. Also shown is (d) 2018 tree heights by canopy position (see Table 2 for codes). In all plots, the dashed horizontal line indicates the 95th percentile of tree heights in the ForestGEO plot.